arXiv:1609.00710v1 [math.ST] 2 Sep 2016

Flexible Bayesian Quantile Regression in Ordinal Models

Mohammad Arshad Rahman*

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India.
Office: Faculty Building 672, IITK, Kanpur. Phone: +91 512-259-7010. Fax: +91 512-259-7570.

Shubham Karnawat

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India.

Abstract

We propose an estimation technique for the flexible Bayesian quantile regression in ordinal (FBQROR) models — an ordinal quantile regression where the error is assumed to follow a generalized asymmetric Laplace (GAL) distribution. The GAL distribution allows to fix specific quantiles while simultaneously letting the mode, skewness and tails to vary; a characteristic nonexistent in the asymmetric Laplace (AL) distribution since a single parameter defines both the quantile and the skewness. We also introduce the cumulative distribution function and the moment generating function of the GAL distribution. Our proposed algorithm for FBQROR model is illustrated in multiple simulation studies and implemented to analyze ordinal categorization of journals. Model comparison exhibit the practical utility of the proposed model.

Keywords: Generalized asymmetric Laplace distribution, Gibbs Sampling, Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC), Metropolis-Hastings, Scimago journal rank.

1. Introduction

Quantile regression, proposed by Koenker and Bassett (1978), models the conditional quantiles of the dependent variable as a function of the covariates. Since its introduction, the concept has gained considerable attention from researchers worldwide and across ideologies. In classical statistics/econometrics, the advantages of quantile regression estimators

*Corresponding author
Email addresses: marshad@iitk.ac.in (Mohammad Arshad Rahman), shubhkt@iitk.ac.in (Shubham Karnawat)

have been well studied and the computational challenges pertaining to optimizing a non-differentiable loss/objective function have also been adequately dealt (Koenker, 2005). The impediment to the development of Bayesian quantile regression was that the errors in a quantile regression model did not or was not assumed to follow any distribution. About two decades later, Koenker and Machado (1999) noted that the quantile loss function appears in the exponent of an asymmetric Laplace (AL) distribution (Kotz et al., 2001; Yu and Zhang, 2005), thus facilitating the construction of a parametric likelihood. This was utilized by Yu and Moyeed (2001) to propose a Bayesian estimation technique for quantile regression in linear models. The estimation algorithm for Bayesian quantile regression was further refined in Tsionas (2003) and Reed and Yu (2009). Kozumi and Kobayashi (2011) developed a Gibbs sampling algorithm using the normal-exponential mixture representation of the AL distribution. The AL likelihood was further exploited and was utilized with/without the normal-exponential mixture to develop algorithms for Bayesian estimation of quantile regression in Tobit models (Yu and Stander, 2007; Kozumi and Kobayashi, 2011), Tobit models with endogenous covariates (Kobayashi, 2016), censored models (Reich and Smith, 2013), count data models (Lee and Neocleous, 2010), binary models (Benoit and Poel, 2010), ordinal models (Rahman, 2016), censored dynamic panel data models (Kozumi and Kobayashi, 2012) and mixed-effect or longitudinal data models (Geraci and Bottai, 2007; Luo et al., 2012). The AL likelihood has also been employed for Bayesian variable selection in quantile regression and some recent work on this topic includes Alhamzawi (2012), Yu et al. (2013) and Alhamzawi (2016).

The above set of papers is an incomplete list of works on Bayesian quantile regression, but they clearly affirm that the AL distribution has played a crucial role in the development of Bayesian quantile regression. However, the AL distribution poses a critical limitation since a single parameter defines both the quantile and skewness of the distribution. Besides, the mode of the distribution is always fixed at the location parameter value μ, for all quantiles. To overcome these drawbacks, Yan and Kottas (2016) proposed the probability density function (*pdf*) of the GAL distribution by introducing a shape parameter into the mean of the normal kernel in the mixture representation of the AL distribution. The GAL distribution uses different parameters for quantile and skewness, and thus adds the much needed flexibility required for Bayesian quantile regression. Yan and Kottas (2016) utilized the GAL *pdf* and proposed algorithms for Bayesian quantile estimation of linear models and regularized quantile regression.

In this paper, we further study the GAL distribution and present the cumulative dis-

tribution function (*cdf*) and moment generating function (*mgf*) of the GAL distribution along with their derivations; and also present a derivation of the GAL *pdf* from the mixture representation mentioned in Yan and Kottas (2016). The hierarchical representation of the GAL density and the GAL *cdf* are utilized to introduce a Bayesian estimation algorithm for the FBQROR model. Estimation of ordinal models, unlike linear models, is more intricate since there are identification restrictions and sampling of cut-points has to satisfy ordering constraints (Jeliazkov et al., 2008; Rahman, 2016). The proposed methodology is illustrated in two simulation studies wherein the errors are generated from a symmetric and a mixture distribution. The FBQROR model is also implemented to predict the ordinal category of statistics and probability journals classified into four categories. In both the simulations and the application, model comparison reveals that the FBQROR model can provide a better model fit compared to a Bayesian quantile regression in ordinal model assuming an AL distribution, henceforth referred to as BQROR model (see Rahman, 2016).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some fundamental characteristics of the GAL distribution. Section 3 presents the FBQROR model and its estimation procedure. Section 4 illustrates the algorithm in two simulation studies and Section 5 implements the algorithm tos study categorization of statistics and probability journals. Section 6 presents some concluding remarks.

2. The GAL Distribution

The GAL distribution, proposed by Yan and Kottas (2016), is obtained by introducing a shape parameter into the mean of the normal kernel in the normal-exponential mixture representation of the AL distribution (see Yu and Zhang, 2005; Rahman, 2016) and mixing with respect to a half-normal distribution. This hierarchical representation allows the skewness and mode to vary for a given quantile/percentile and hence imports the much needed flexibility required for Bayesian quantile regression.

Suppose Y is a random variable that has the following mixture representation,

$$Y = \mu + \sigma\alpha S + \sigma AW + \sigma[BW]^{\frac{1}{2}}U \tag{1}$$

where $S \sim N^{+}(0,1)$, $W \sim \mathcal{E}(1)$, $U \sim N(0,1)$, $A \equiv A(p) = \frac{1-2p}{p(1-p)}$ and $B \equiv B(p) = \frac{2}{p(1-p)}$. Here, $N^{+}, \mathcal{E}, N$ denote half-normal, exponential and normal distributions, respec-

tively. Then, Y follows a GAL distribution denoted $Y \sim GAL(\mu, \sigma, p, \alpha)$ and has the *pdf*,

$$f(y|\theta) = \frac{2p(1-p)}{\sigma}\left(\left[\Phi\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) - \Phi\left(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right)\right]\exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right)^2\right\}\right.$$
$$\left.\times\, I\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} > 0\right) + \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha} I\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} > 0\right)\right)\exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}\right)^2\right\}\right), \tag{2}$$

where $\theta = (\mu, \sigma, p, \alpha)$, $y^* = (y - \mu)/\sigma$, μ is the location parameter, σ is the scale parameter, α is the shape parameter, $p_{\alpha_+} = p - I(\alpha > 0)$, $p_{\alpha_-} = p - I(\alpha < 0)$ with $p \in (0, 1)$. The derivation of the GAL *pdf* from the hierarchical representation is presented in Appendix A.1 and largely follows the notations used in Yan and Kottas (2016). Note that when $\alpha = 0$, the GAL *pdf* reduces to the *pdf* of an AL distribution.

We explore the GAL distribution in greater detail and propose the *cdf* and *mgf* of the GAL distribution. The *cdf* denoted by F can be compactly written as,

$$F(y|\theta) = \left(1 - 2\Phi\left(-\frac{y^*}{|\alpha|}\right) - \frac{2p(1-p)}{p_{\alpha_-}}\exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}\left[\Phi\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. - \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\right]\right) I\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} > 0\right) + I(\alpha < 0) - \frac{2p(1-p)}{p_{\alpha_+}}\exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}$$
$$\times\, \Phi\left[\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha} I\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} > 0\right)\right], \tag{3}$$

and the *mgf* denoted by $M_Y(t)$ has the following expression,

$$M_Y(t) = 2p(1-p)\left[\frac{(p_{\alpha_+} - p_{\alpha_-})}{(p_{\alpha_-} - \sigma t)(p_{\alpha_+} - \sigma t)}\right]\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2 t^2\right\}\Phi\left(|\alpha|\sigma t\right). \tag{4}$$

Both the *cdf* and *mgf* have been derived and presented in Appendix A.2 and Appendix A.3, respectively. In addition, Appendix A.3 utilizes the *mgf* (4) to derive the mean, variance and skewness of the distribution. These distributional characteristics are extremely important for better understanding of the GAL distribution and for further development of Bayesian quantile regression.

However, the GAL density given by equation (2) has the limitation that the parameter p no longer corresponds to the cumulative probability at the quantile for $\alpha \neq 0$. Following, Yan and Kottas (2016), we let $\gamma = [I(\alpha > 0) - p]|\alpha|$ and re-express the mixture representation (1) as follows,

$$Y = \mu + \sigma C|\gamma|S + \sigma AW + \sigma[BW]^{\frac{1}{2}}U, \tag{5}$$

where $C = [I(\gamma > 0) - p]^{-1}$. This re-parametrization yields the quantile-fixed GAL distribution that has the following *pdf*:

$$f_{p_0}(y|\eta) = \frac{2p(1-p)}{\sigma}\left(\left[\Phi\left(-y^*\frac{p_{\gamma_+}}{|\gamma|} + \frac{p_{\gamma_-}}{p_{\gamma_+}}|\gamma|\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{p_{\gamma_-}}{p_{\gamma_+}}|\gamma|\right)\right]\exp\left\{-y^*p_{\gamma_-} + \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\left(\frac{p_{\gamma_-}}{p_{\gamma_+}}\right)^2\right\}\right.$$
$$\left.\times I\left(\frac{y^*}{\gamma} > 0\right) + \Phi\left(-|\gamma| + y^*\frac{p_{\gamma_+}}{|\gamma|}I\left(\frac{y^*}{\gamma} > 0\right)\right)\exp\left\{-y^*p_{\gamma_+} + \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\right\}\right), \quad (6)$$

where $\eta = (\mu, \sigma, \gamma)$, $p \equiv p(\gamma, p_0) = I(\gamma < 0) + [p_0 - I(\gamma < 0)]/g(\gamma)$, $p_{\gamma_+} = p - I(\gamma > 0)$ and $p_{\gamma_-} = p - I(\gamma < 0)$. The function $g(\gamma) = 2\Phi(-|\gamma|)\exp(\gamma^2/2)$ and $\gamma \in (L, U)$, where L is the negative square root of $g(\gamma) = 1 - p_0$ and U is the positive square root of $g(\gamma) = p_0$ (Yan and Kottas, 2016). The term "quantile-fixed" suggests that integration of GAL *pdf* (6) to the upper limit μ equals p_0, so for regression purpose we can fix the quantile. The *cdf* for the quantile-fixed GAL density (6) can be analogously derived as in Appendix A.2 to yield the following expression,

$$F_{p_0}(y|\eta) = \left(1 - 2\Phi\left(y^*\frac{p_{\gamma_+}}{\gamma}\right) + 2p_{\gamma_+}\exp\left\{-y^*p_{\gamma_-} + \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\left(\frac{p_{\gamma_-}}{p_{\gamma_+}}\right)^2\right\}\left[\Phi\left(-y^*\frac{p_{\gamma_+}}{|\gamma|} + \frac{p_{\gamma_-}}{p_{\gamma_+}}|\gamma|\right)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. - \Phi\left(\frac{p_{\gamma_-}}{p_{\gamma_+}}|\gamma|\right)\right]\right)I\left(\frac{y^*}{\gamma} > 0\right) + I(\gamma < 0) + 2p_{\gamma_-}\exp\left\{-y^*p_{\gamma_+} + \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\right\}$$
$$\times\Phi\left(-|\gamma| + y^*\frac{p_{\gamma_+}}{|\gamma|}I\left(\frac{y^*}{\gamma} > 0\right)\right).$$

The quantile-fixed *cdf* (7) is required for constructing the likelihood of the FBQROR model and plays a critical role in the MCMC sampling of the cut-points/thresholds.

To better discern the GAL distribution, Figure 1 presents a graphical comparison of the quantile-fixed GAL and AL *pdf*'s for three different quantiles. We observe that the GAL distribution, unlike the AL distribution, allows the mode to vary rather than being fixed at $\mu = 0$ at all quantiles. Additionally, at the median $p_0 = 0.50$, the GAL distribution can be positively ($\gamma < 0$) or negatively ($\gamma > 0$) skewed and can have tails which are heavier or narrower than the AL distribution. These characteristics make the GAL distribution more flexible than the AL distribution.



Figure 1: Probability density plots of the AL ($\gamma = 0$) and the GAL ($\gamma \neq 0$) distributions.

3. The FBQROR Model

Ordinal models arise when the dependent (response) variable is discrete and outcomes are inherently ordered or ranked such that the scores assigned to outcomes have an ordinal meaning, but no cardinal interpretation (Johnson and Albert, 2000; Jeliazkov and Rahman, 2012). For example, in a survey on public opinion to allow more offshore drilling, responses may be recorded as follows: 1 for 'strongly oppose', 2 for 'somewhat oppose', 3 for 'somewhat support' and 4 for 'strongly support' (Mukherjee and Rahman, 2016). The responses have ordinal meaning but no cardinal interpretation, so one cannot say that a score of 4 implies 33.33% more support compared to a score of 3.

We adopt the latent variable approach and represent the FBQROR model using a a continuous latent random variable z_i expressed as a function of covariates and error as,

$$z_i = x_i'\beta + \epsilon_i, \qquad \forall\, i = 1, \cdots, n, \tag{7}$$

where x_i is a $k \times 1$ vector of covariates, β_p is a $k \times 1$ vector of unknown parameters at the p_0-th quantile, ϵ_i follows a GAL distribution, i.e., $\epsilon_i \sim GAL(0, \sigma, \gamma)$ and n denotes the number of observations. Note that we have suppressed the dependence of parameters on p_0 for notational simplicity. The variable z_i is unobserved and relates to the observed discrete

response y_i, which has J categories or outcomes, via the cut-point vector ξ as follows:

$$\xi_{j-1} < z_i \leq \xi_j \;\Rightarrow\; y_i = j, \qquad \forall\, i = 1, \cdots, n;\; j = 1, \cdots, J, \tag{8}$$

where $\xi_0 = -\infty$ and $\xi_J = \infty$. In addition, ξ_1 is typically set to 0, which anchors the location of the distribution required for parameter identification (see Jeliazkov et al., 2008). Given the data vector $y = (y_1, \cdots, y_n)'$, the likelihood for the model expressed as a function of unknown parameters $(\beta, \sigma, \gamma, \xi)$ can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\beta, \sigma, \gamma, \xi; y) &= \prod_{i=1}^{n} \prod_{j=1}^{J} P(y_i = j|\beta, \sigma, \xi, \gamma)^{I(y_i=j)} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{n} \prod_{j=1}^{J} \left[F_{p_0}\left(\frac{\xi_j - x_i'\beta_p}{\sigma} \right) - F_{p_0}\left(\frac{\xi_{j-1} - x_i'\beta}{\sigma} \right) \right]^{I(y_i=j)} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where, $F_{p_0}(\cdot) \equiv F(\cdot|0, 1, \gamma)$ denotes the *cdf* of the GAL distribution and $I(y_i = j)$ is an indicator function, which equals 1 if $y_i = j$ and 0 otherwise.

Working directly with the GAL distribution is difficult, so we replace the error term with its mixture representation (1) and rewrite the FBQROR model as follows:

$$z_i = x_i'\beta + \sigma A w_i + \sigma C|\gamma| s_i + \sigma\sqrt{B w_i}\, u_i, \qquad \forall\, i = 1, \cdots, n. \tag{10}$$

The above formulation (10) implies that the latent variable $z_i|\beta, w_i, s_i, \sigma, \gamma \sim N(x_i'\beta + \sigma C|\gamma| s_i + \sigma A w_i, \sigma^2 B w_i)$. However, the presence of the scale parameter σ in the conditional mean is not conducive to the construction of MCMC algorithm (Kozumi and Kobayashi, 2011). So, we reparameterize and write the model as,

$$z_i = x_i'\beta + A\nu_i + C|\gamma| h_i + \sqrt{\sigma B \nu_i}\, u_i, \qquad \forall\, i = 1, \cdots, n, \tag{11}$$

where $h_i = \sigma s_i$ and $\nu_i = \sigma w_i$. Both reparameterizations are necessary for computational efficiency and a simpler MCMC algorithm. Note that the first reparameterization was not utilized in Yan and Kottas (2016) and hence our approach can improve the Bayesian method for quantile regression and lasso regularized quantile regression of Yan and Kottas (2016).

Ordinal models present two additional challenges: location and scale restrictions for identification of the parameters and ordering constraints in sampling of cut-points ξ (see Jeliazkov et al., 2008; Rahman, 2016). In the FBQROR model, both location and scale

restrictions are enforced by fixing two cut-points since the variance of a GAL distribution is not fixed due to its dependence on α even if we set $\sigma = 1$ (see Theorem 4 in Appendix A). The ordering constraint is resolved following Rahman (2016), by using the following logarithmic transformation,

$$\delta_j = \ln(\xi_{j+2} - \xi_{j+1}), \qquad 1 \leq j \leq J-3. \tag{12}$$

The original cut-points can then be obtained using equation (12) by one-to-one mapping between $\delta = (\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{J-3})'$ and $\xi = (\xi_3, \cdots, \xi_{J-1})'$, where ξ_2 is fixed at some constant c, and recall that $\xi_0 = -\infty$, $\xi_1 = 0$ and $\xi_J = \infty$.

We next employ the Bayes' theorem and derive the joint posterior density as proportional to the product of the likelihood and prior distributions. We employ standard prior distributions as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &\sim N(\beta_0, B_0), & \sigma &\sim IG(n_0/2, d_0/2), \\ \gamma &\sim Unif(L, U), & \delta &\sim N(\delta_0, D_0), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where N, IG and $Unif$ denote normal, inverse-gamma and uniform distributions, respectively. The lower and upper bounds of the uniform distribution are obtained as mentioned in Section 2. Combining the likelihood and prior distributions, the joint posterior density can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(z, \beta, \nu, h, \sigma, \gamma, \delta | y) &\propto f(y|z, \beta, \nu, h, \sigma, \gamma, \delta)\pi(z|\beta, \nu, h, \sigma, \gamma)\pi(\nu|\sigma)\pi(h|\sigma)\pi(\beta) \\ &\quad \times \pi(\sigma)\pi(\gamma)\pi(\delta) \\ &\propto \Big\{ \prod_{i=1}^{n} f(y_i|z_i, \beta, \nu_i, h_i, \sigma, \gamma, \delta)\pi(\nu_i|\sigma)\pi(h_i|\sigma) \Big\} \pi(z|\beta, \sigma, \nu, h, \gamma) \\ &\quad \times \pi(\beta)\pi(\sigma)\pi(\gamma)\pi(\delta) \\ &\propto \Big\{ \prod_{i=1}^{n} f(y_i|z_i, \delta)\pi(\nu_i|\sigma)\pi(h_i|\sigma) \Big\} \pi(z|\beta, \sigma, \nu, h, \gamma) \\ &\quad \times \pi(\beta)\pi(\sigma)\pi(\gamma)\pi(\delta), \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where the likelihood, based on $GAL(0, \sigma, \gamma)$, uses the fact that given z and δ, the observed y is independent of the remaining parameters, because (8) determines y_i given (z, δ) with probability 1. The conditional density of latent data z can be obtained from (11) and is given by $\pi(z|\beta, \sigma, \nu, h, \gamma) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} N(z_i|x_i'\beta + A\nu_i + C|\gamma|h_i, \sigma B\nu_i)$. Additionally, the prior distributions for $(\beta, \sigma, \gamma, \delta)$ are assumed to be independent in equation (14). Using the preceding

Algorithm 1 (Sampling in FBQROR Model)

(1) Sample $\beta|z,\nu,h,\sigma,\gamma \sim N(\tilde{\beta},\tilde{B})$, where

$$\tilde{B}^{-1} = \left(B_0^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_i x_i'}{\sigma B \nu_i}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta} = \tilde{B}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_i(z_i - A\nu_i - C|\gamma|h_i)}{\sigma B \nu_i} + B_0^{-1}\beta_0\right).$$

(2) Sample $\nu_i|z_i,\beta,h,\sigma,\gamma \sim GIG(0.5, a_i, b)$, for $i = 1,\ldots,n$, where

$$a_i = \frac{(z_i - x_i'\beta - C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{\sigma B} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \left(\frac{A^2}{\sigma B} + \frac{2}{\sigma}\right).$$

(3) $\sigma|z,\beta,\nu,h,\gamma \sim IG(\tilde{n}/2, \tilde{d}/2)$, where

$$\tilde{n} = 3n + n_0, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{d} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(z_i - x_i'\beta - A\nu_i - C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{B\nu_i} + 2\sum_{i=1}^{n}\nu_i + d_0.$$

(4) Sample γ and h in one block as follows:

(a) Sample $\gamma|\beta,\sigma,\delta,y$ marginally of (z,ν,h) using an MH step, where the proposed draw γ' is generated from a scaled-Beta distribution $SB(a,b,L,U)$. Return γ' with probability,

$$\alpha_{MH}(\gamma_c,\gamma') = \min\left\{0, \ln\left[\frac{f(y|\beta,\sigma,\delta,\gamma')\,\pi(\beta,\sigma,\delta,\gamma')}{f(y|\beta,\sigma,\delta,\gamma_c)\,\pi(\beta,\sigma,\delta,\gamma_c)}\,\frac{\pi_{SB}(\gamma_c|a,b,L,U)}{\pi_{SB}(\gamma'|a,b,L,U)}\right]\right\},$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is the full likelihood (9); otherwise, repeat the current value γ_c.

(b) Sample $h_i|z_i,\beta,\nu_i,\sigma,\gamma \sim N^+(\mu_{h_i},\sigma_{h_i}^2)$ for $i = 1,\ldots,n$, where

$$(\sigma_{h_i}^2)^{-1} = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} + \frac{C^2\gamma^2}{\sigma B \nu_i}\right) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mu_{h_i} = \sigma_{h_i}^2\left(\frac{C|\gamma|(z_i - x_i'\beta - A\nu_i)}{\sigma B \nu_i}\right).$$

(5) Sample $\delta|\beta,\sigma,\gamma,y$ marginally of (z,ν,h), by generating the proposed value δ' using a random walk chain $\delta' = \delta + u$, where $u \sim N(0_{J-3}, \iota^2\hat{D})$, ι is a tuning parameter, and $\hat{D}$ denotes negative inverse Hessian, obtained by maximising the log-likelihood with respect to δ. Given the current value δ_c and δ', accept δ' with probability,

$$\alpha_{MH}(\delta_c,\delta') = \min\left\{0, \ln\left[\frac{f(y|\beta,\sigma,\gamma,\delta')\,\pi(\beta,\sigma,\gamma,\delta')}{f(y|\beta,\sigma,\gamma,\delta_c)\,\pi(\beta,\sigma,\gamma,\delta_c)}\right]\right\},$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is the full likelihood (9); otherwise, δ_c is repeated. The variance of u may be tuned as required for an appropriate step-size and acceptance rate.

(6) Sample $z_i|y,\beta,\nu_i,h_i,\sigma,\gamma \sim TN_{(\xi_{j-1},\xi_j)}(x_i'\beta + A\nu_i + C|\gamma|h_i, \sigma B\nu_i)$ for $i = 1,2,\ldots,n$, where ξ is obtained from δ by one-to-one mapping using equation (12).

explanations, the "complete data" posterior based on equation (14) can be expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(z,\beta,\nu,h,\sigma,\gamma,\delta|y) \propto \Bigg\{ \prod_{i=1}^{n} 1\Big\{\xi_{y_i-1} < z_i < \xi_{y_i}\Big\} N(z_i|x_i'\beta + A\nu_i + C|\gamma|h_i, \sigma B\nu_i) \\ \times \mathcal{E}(\nu_i|\sigma)\, N^{+}(h_i|0,\sigma^2)\Bigg\} N(\beta|\beta_0, B_0)\, IG(\sigma|n_0/2, d_0/2) \\ \times Unif(\gamma|L,U)\, N(\delta|\delta_0, D_0).\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The conditional posterior densities can be derived from the complete data posterior (15) and judiciously using the full likelihood (9) to sample the objects of interest $(z, \beta, \nu, h, \sigma, \gamma, \delta)$ as presented in Algorithm 1.

The sampling of the parameters in FBQROR model primarily involves drawing from the respective conditional posteriors, with the exception of the shape parameter γ and cut-points δ. Starting with the regression coefficients, β is sampled from a normal distribution, draws which are programmed in all known statistical softwares. The latent weight ν follows a generalized inverse-Gaussian (GIG) distribution, draws from which can be obtained using the ratio of uniforms method or the envelope rejection method (Dagpunar, 1988, 1989, 2007). Next, the scale parameter σ is sampled from an inverse-Gamma distribution, again routinely programmed in all softwares. Blocking is employed to sample the shape parameter γ and latent weight h, since sampling them conditional on each other (and remaining parameters) leads to highly autocorrelated MCMC draws for γ, which results in high inefficiency factor (Greenberg, 2012). Such high autocorrelation and inefficiency factor is common when objects of interest (γ and h in our case) appear in a product form and both objects are sampled from their conditional posteriors. To avoid high autocorrelation, γ is sampled marginally of (z, ν, h) from the full joint posterior using a Metropolis-Hastings (MH) step, where the proposal values are drawn from a scaled-Beta distribution. The mixture variable h is sampled conditional on γ from a half-normal distribution. Typical to ordinal models, the cut-points δ do not have a tractable distribution and is sampled marginally of (z, ν, h) using a random-walk MH algorithm (see Jeliazkov et al., 2008; Rahman, 2016). Finally, the latent variable z, conditional on the remaining parameters in the model, is sampled from a truncated normal distribution (Botev, 2016). The derivations of the conditional posteriors and details of the MH algorithms are presented in Appendix B.

4. Simulation Studies

This section demonstrates the performance of the proposed algorithm in two simulation studies and compares the fit of the FBQROR model with that of the BQROR model where the error follows an AL distribution.

4.1. Simulation Study 1

In this simulation study, we demonstrate the performance of the proposed algorithm to estimate the FBQROR model when errors are generated from a symmetric distribution. In particular, 300 observations are generated from the model $z_i = x_i'\beta + \epsilon_i$, where covariates are sampled from a standard uniform distribution $Unif[0,1]$, $\beta = (2,-3,4)'$ and ϵ is sampled from a logistic distribution $\mathcal{L}(0,\pi^2/3)$. The continuous variable z is utilized to construct the discrete response variable y based on the cut-point vector $\xi = (0,2,4)$. In our simulated data, the number of observations corresponding to the four categories of y are 42, 81, 99 and 78, respectively.

The posterior estimates of the model parameters are obtained based on the simulated data and the following priors: $\beta \sim N(0_3, 10I_3)$, $\sigma \sim IG(5/2, 8/2)$, $\gamma \sim Unif(L,U)$ and $\delta \sim N(0_{J-3}, 0.25\, I_{J-3})$ for $p_0 = (0.25, 0.5, 0.75)$, where (L,U) depends on the value of p_0 as mentioned in Section 2. Table 1 reports the MCMC results obtained from 15,000 iterations, after a burn-in of 5,000 iterations, along with the inefficiency factors calculated using the batch-means method (Greenberg, 2012). In the MH sampling of γ, the proposed values are generated from $SB(2,2,L,U)$, where SB denotes a scaled-Beta distribution over the support (L,U). Random-walk MH algorithm is utilized to sample δ and the tuning parameter is set at $\iota = \sqrt{8}$. MH acceptance rates for γ and δ at the three considered quantiles are

Table 1: Posterior mean (MEAN), standard deviation (STD) and inefficiency factor (IF) of the FBQROR model parameters in Simulation Study 1.

	25TH QUANTILE			50TH QUANTILE			75TH QUANTILE		
PARAMETERS	MEAN	STD	IF	MEAN	STD	IF	MEAN	STD	IF
β_1	1.04	0.30	4.54	2.14	0.31	2.50	3.12	0.34	5.08
β_2	−3.06	0.48	5.31	−3.05	0.47	3.13	−2.95	0.45	5.14
β_3	3.75	0.49	5.32	3.74	0.48	3.52	3.64	0.47	4.71
σ	0.44	0.14	7.64	0.74	0.17	2.36	0.52	0.11	6.45
γ	1.60	0.39	2.44	−0.05	0.18	3.45	−1.29	0.37	7.19
δ_1	0.63	0.18	4.68	0.66	0.15	4.17	0.59	0.14	6.59

$(20.88\%, 29.89\%, 20.32\%)$ and $(33.36\%, 35.24\%, 28.49\%)$, respectively. All the inefficiency factors are low which imply small correlation in MCMC draws and trace plots (not shown to save space) of the MCMC iterations display quick convergence. The sampler is reasonably quick and takes approximately 280 seconds per $1,000$ iterations.

The results in Table 1 show that the posterior means for β are close to the true parameter values, posterior mean of σ is reasonable and the posterior mean of δ_1 yields a value of ξ_3 close to 4, the true value used to generate the data. The posterior mean of γ at $p_0 = (0.25, 0.50, 0.75)$ are $(1.60, -0.05, -1.29)$, which corresponds to a skewness of $(-0.21, 0.17, 0.14)$, respectively. Note that the posterior mean of γ at the median is statistically not different from zero. These skewness values imply that the (latent) response variable is about symmetric at all the considered quantiles, which is reassuring since our data was generated from a symmetric distribution. In contrast, if we estimate a Bayesian quantile ordinal model assuming an AL error distribution (i.e., BQROR model), which is more rigid, the corresponding skewness values are $(1.64, 0, -1.64)$. Hence, the BQROR model fails to accommodate the symmetric characteristic of the data at the 25th, 75th and all other quantiles.

We next investigate model fitting at different quantiles, since one may interpret various choices of quantile p_0 as corresponding to a different link function. To assess model fit, we calculate the deviance information criterion or DIC (Spiegelhalter et al., 2002; Gelman et al., 2013), since it can be easily computed from MCMC draws. DIC is computed based on observed data y and parameter $\theta = (\beta, \sigma, \gamma, \xi)$ using the definition: $\text{DIC} = 2\widehat{D}(y) - D(\hat{\theta}(y))$, where deviance $D(y, \theta) = -2 \ln f(y|\theta)$ with $f(y|\theta)$ representing the full likelihood (9), $\widehat{D}(y)$ is posterior mean of the deviance and $D(\hat{\theta}(y))$ is the deviance evaluated at the posterior mean. The DIC values for the FBQROR model at the three quartiles are 690.18, 693.19 and 690.45, respectively; and hence the model fits are comparable. To demonstrate the advantages of FBQROR model, the BQROR model was also estimated using a modification of Algorithm 1 in Rahman (2016) – by fixing the second cut-point and introducing a scale parameter. The corresponding DIC values for the BQROR model are 701.21, 689.31 and 705.43, respectively. Clearly, the DIC values for the FBQROR model are relatively lower at the 25th and 75th quantiles and hence outperforms the BQROR model, but both models are comparable at the median (since difference in DIC's is less than 5). The poorer fit of the BQROR model reflects the rigidity of the AL distribution, since $p_0 = 0.25$ (0.75) forces the AL distribution to be positively (negatively) skewed.

4.2. Simulation Study 2

In this simulation study, we estimate the FBQROR model when errors are generated from a mixture of logistic distributions such that the resulting error distribution is extremely positively skewed. In particular, 300 observations are generated from the model $z_i = x_i'\beta + \epsilon_i$, where covariates are sampled from a standard uniform distribution $Unif[0, 1]$, $\beta = (2, 2, -4)'$ and ϵ is sampled from a mixture of $\mathcal{L}(-1, \pi^2/3)$ and $\mathcal{L}(6, 4\pi^2/3)$ with mix proportions 0.7 and 0.3, respectively. The discrete response variable y is obtained from z based on cut-point vector $\xi = (0, 2, 6)$, which yields 116, 94, 49 and 41 observations in the four categories of y.

Table 2 reports the MCMC estimates obtained from 15,000 iterations after a burn-in of 5,000 iterations, wherein we have utilized the same prior distributions as in the first simulation study. However, unlike the first simulation, we vary the proposal distribution for γ at different quantiles to increase the MH acceptance rate. Specifically, the proposed draws are generated from $SB(2, 5, L, U)$, $SB(2, 4, L, U)$, and $SB(4, 2, L, U)$ at the 25th, 50th and 75th quantile, respectively. MH sampling of δ is identical to the first simulation. The resulting acceptance rates for γ and δ at the three considered quantiles are $(24.91\%, 18.95\%, 20.08\%)$ and $(39.13\%, 40.69\%, 37.75\%)$, respectively. The inefficiency factors are low, trace plots (not shown) show quick convergence and computational time is approximately unchanged.

The results in Table 2 show that the posterior estimates for β are close to the true values $(2, 2, -4)$, but the proximity is less compared to the first simulation. This deterioration is due to the domination of the error component in the data generating model and not due to sampling the error from an asymmetric distribution. In fact, Classical linear regression (with continuous response) in this study yields $R^2 = 0.24$ compared to $R^2 = 0.72$ in the first simulation study. The posterior estimates of the remaining parameters are appropriate and

Table 2: Posterior mean (MEAN), standard deviation (STD) and inefficiency factor (IF) of the FBQROR model parameters in Simulation Study 2.

	25TH QUANTILE			50TH QUANTILE			75TH QUANTILE		
PARAMETERS	MEAN	STD	IF	MEAN	STD	IF	MEAN	STD	IF
β_1	0.32	0.35	2.57	1.54	0.36	3.29	2.97	0.39	3.17
β_2	0.88	0.49	2.79	0.80	0.49	3.10	0.65	0.53	2.88
β_3	−2.94	0.54	3.53	−3.03	0.53	3.56	−2.50	0.57	3.19
σ	0.77	0.12	4.58	0.74	0.18	6.96	0.89	0.15	5.84
γ	0.22	0.19	4.16	−0.47	0.16	6.90	−1.15	0.28	6.39
δ_1	0.66	0.17	2.37	0.61	0.17	2.41	0.37	0.17	2.76

that of γ captures the skewness extremely well. More specifically, the posterior mean of γ is not statistically different from zero at the 25th quantile, so skewness is 1.64 and equals that of BQROR model. However, the skewness at the 50th (75th) quantile is 1.29 (0.01) compared to a skewness of 0 (-1.64) in the BQROR model. Hence, the FBQROR model is more consistent with the data. Model comparison also points to the superiority of the FBQROR model. The DIC for the FBQROR model at the three quartiles are 743.92, 746.67 and 768.20, respectively; but that of the BQROR model are 741.55, 754.39 and 786.48, respectively. Consequently, the FBQROR and BQROR models are equivalent at the 25th quantile, but the former provides an exceedingly better fit at the 50th and 75th quantiles.

5. Application

Across the world, established and budding academic/research scholars aspire to publish their work in the best journals typically measured by some journal level metrics such as impact factor, eigen factor, source normalized impact factor, scimago journal rank (SJR) and altmetrics. While each metrics offer a certain advantage, the SJR ranking is a reasonably robust metric and aims to measure scientific influence of scholarly journals that account for both the number of citations received by a journal and the importance or prestige of the journals generating the citations. In this application, we classify the SJR statistics and probability journal ranking for 2015 into four categories and employ our FBQROR model to predict the category of a journal within the sample. The concerned data is publicly available at `http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php?category=2613`.

The ordinal ranking of the journals is constructed from the continuous SJR metrics based on cut-point vector $\xi = (0.5, 1, 2)$, which yields 61 (35.06%), 50 (28.74%), 41 (23.56%) and 22 (22.64%) observations in the four categories of y. Higher SJR values denote better journals and hence, the lower (higher) ranked journals forms the highest (lowest) fraction in our data. Model covariates include an intercept and the three variables presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Definition of the covariates and descriptive statistics.

VARIABLES	DESCRIPTION	MEAN	STD
LOG HINDEX	Logarithm of number of articles (h) that have received at least 'h' citations in 2015.	3.04	1.02
LOG CITE3	Logarithm of number of citations received in 2015 by journal's document published in 2014, 2013 and 2012.	4.64	1.56
LOG DOC3	Logarithm of journal's published articles in 2014, 2013 and 2012.	4.96	1.06

Table 4: Posterior mean (MEAN), standard deviation (STD) and inefficiency factor (IF) of the FBQROR model parameters in the journal categorization application.

	25TH QUANTILE			50TH QUANTILE			75TH QUANTILE		
PARAMETERS	MEAN	STD	IF	MEAN	STD	IF	MEAN	STD	IF
INTERCEPT	−0.39	0.71	3.11	0.01	0.80	3.10	0.81	0.76	3.22
LOG HINDEX	1.09	0.29	3.49	0.94	0.30	3.56	0.93	0.30	3.53
LOG CITE3	2.18	0.33	4.75	2.42	0.40	5.67	2.28	0.34	5.50
LOG DOC3	−2.62	0.34	6.15	−2.64	0.38	6.24	−2.54	0.35	6.21
σ	0.47	0.07	4.65	0.52	0.08	4.21	0.46	0.07	3.66
γ	1.05	0.27	3.05	0.20	0.18	3.21	−0.89	0.40	3.14
δ_1	0.73	0.19	5.03	0.76	0.19	5.67	0.68	0.18	5.06

We use logarithm of "hindex" and hence a total of 4 journals with zero "hindex" have been discarded. This restriction leaves us with a sample of 175 observations, for which a Bayesian analysis seems particularly useful.

Table 4 reports the MCMC estimates obtained from 10,000 iterations after a burn-in of 5,000 iterations, wherein we have utilized the same prior distributions for (β, σ, δ) as in the simulation studies, but vary the proposal distribution for γ to increase the MH acceptance rate. Specifically, the proposed draws are generated from $SB(2, 5, L, U)$, $SB(2, 2, L, U)$, and $SB(2, 2, L, U)$ for the three considered quantiles, respectively. MH sampling of δ is identical to the two simulation studies. The resulting acceptance rates for γ and δ at the three quantiles are $(23.34\%, 28.30\%, 28.02\%)$ and $(29.21\%, 32.36\%, 28.02\%)$, respectively. The inefficiency factors are low, trace plots (not shown) show quick convergence and computational time is approximately 150 seconds per 1,000 iterations.

The results in Table 4 show that the posterior estimates of the regression coefficients are all statistically different from zero and do not change signs at different quantiles. Specifically, higher values of "log hindex" and "log cite3" increases the probability of being a higher ranked journal, while higher "log Doc3" reduces the probability of being a high rank journal. However, the last two variables have strong correlation, but they have been included in the model to better predict a journal's category which is our primary objective. The remaining parameters i.e., (σ, γ, δ) have appropriate posterior estimates and they are statistically different from zero at all the considered quantiles. To assess the predictability of our model, we utilize hit-rate defined as the percentage of correct predictions i.e., percentage of observations for which the model correctly assigns the highest probability to the observed response category (Johnson and Albert, 2000; Mukherjee and Rahman, 2016). The hit-rate for the

FBQROR model at the 25th, 50th and 75th quantiles are 62.07, 63.79 and 63.79, respectively. Similarly, the corresponding DIC for the FBQROR models are 283.43, 283.06 and 281.21, which implies that the three models are comparable. We also estimated the BQROR model for this application and computed the DIC which stood at 289.16, 281.17 and 282.07, respectively. Hence, the FBQROR model provides a better fit at the 25th quantile, while the models are comparable at the 50th and 75th quantiles.

6. Conclusion

The paper presents an estimation algorithm for Bayesian quantile regression in univariate ordinal models where the error is assumed to follow a GAL distribution, referred to as the FBQROR model. To propose this estimation procedure, we explore the GAL distribution and both introduce and derive its cumulative distribution function and moment generating function. We show that the advantages offered by the GAL distribution – which allows the mode, skewness and tails to vary for any given quantile – can be gainfully utilized to estimate Bayesian quantile regression in ordinal models. In particular, results from multiple simulation studies with different error distributions reveal that ordinal models assuming a GAL distribution can provide better model fit compared to ordinal models assuming an AL distribution, termed BQROR model and proposed in Rahman (2016). Our proposed algorithm is also implemented in an application to predict ordinal category of journals using scimago journal ranking data for statistics and probability journals. Once again, we see that the proposed FBQROR model outperforms the BQROR model.

The GAL distribution proposed in Yan and Kottas (2016) and further studied in this paper is relatively new and hence needs to be studied further, particularly due to it s usefulness in Bayesian quantile regression. In fact, the GAL distribution can practically be employed to estimate most Bayesian quantile regression models that have been estimated using the AL distribution. A partial list includes the Tobit model, Tobit model with endogenous covariates, censored model, count data model, mixed-effect or longitudinal data model (work in progress) and censored dynamic panel data model. Moreover, the distribution can also be utilized to explore Bayesian variable selection in all the above mentioned models. We leave these opportunities for future research.

Appendix A. The GAL Distribution

This appendix derives the *pdf* of the GAL distribution from the mixture representation, introduces the *cdf* and *mgf* of the GAL distribution. The *mgf* is also utilized to derive the mean, variance and skewness of the GAL distribution.

Appendix A.1. Probability Density Function

Theorem 1: Suppose $Y \sim GAL(\mu, \sigma, p, \alpha)$ and has the *pdf* given by equation (2), then Y has the following hierarchical representation, $Y = \mu + \alpha\sigma S + \sigma A(p)W + \sigma[B(p)W]^{\frac{1}{2}}U$, where all the notations are as in Section 2.

Proof: Using the mixture representation we can write the *pdf* of Y as,

$$\begin{aligned} f(y|\theta) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^+}\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} N(y|\mu+\sigma\alpha s+\sigma A(p)w, \sigma^2 B(p)w)\exp(w|1)N^+(s|0,1)dw\,ds \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 B(p)}} \int_0^\infty \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi w}}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{(y-b-aw)^2}{cw}\right]-w\right\}dw\right] N^+(s|0,1)\,ds \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where $a = \sigma A(p) = \frac{\sigma(1-2p)}{p(1-p)}$, $b = \mu + \sigma\alpha s$, and $c = \sigma^2 B(p) = \frac{2\sigma^2}{p(1-p)}$. We let P denote the second integral and integrate with respect to w as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi w}}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{(a^2+2c)w^2+(y-b)^2-2a(y-b)w)}{cw}\right]\right\}dw \\ &= \exp\left\{\frac{a(y-b)}{c}\right\}\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi w}}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{(a^2+2c)}{c}w+\frac{(y-b)^2}{cw}\right]\right\}dw \\ &= \exp\left\{\frac{a(y-b)}{c}\right\}\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{2\pi w}}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\gamma}}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\gamma w+\frac{\gamma}{\mu^2 w}-\frac{2\gamma}{\mu}+\frac{2\gamma}{\mu}\right]\right\}dw \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}\exp\left\{-\frac{\gamma}{\mu}\right\}\exp\left\{\frac{a(y-b)}{c}\right\}\underbrace{\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{2\pi w}}\exp\left\{-\frac{\gamma}{2}\left(\frac{(1-\mu w)^2}{\mu^2 w}\right)\right\}dw}_{\text{integrates to 1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}\exp\left\{-\frac{\gamma}{\mu}\right\}\exp\left\{\frac{a(y-b)}{c}\right\} \qquad \text{(for } \gamma,\mu>0\text{)}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where third line makes the substitutions $\gamma = \frac{a^2+2c}{c} = \frac{1}{2p(1-p)}$, $\mu^2 = \frac{\gamma c}{(y-b)^2} = \frac{\sigma^2}{p^2(1-p)^2(y-b)^2}$, and $\mu = \frac{\sigma}{p(1-p)|y-b|}$. In the fourth line, integration with respect to w yields 1 because it is the *pdf* of a reciprocal inverse-Gaussian distribution i.e. $w \sim RIG(\gamma, \mu)$. Substituting the

values of (γ, μ, a, b, c) in equation (A.2) and canceling terms we get,

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \sqrt{2p(1-p)}\ \exp\left\{\frac{(1-2p)(y-b)}{2\sigma} - \frac{|y-b|}{2\sigma}\right\} \\ &= \sqrt{2p(1-p)}\ \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{\sigma}\left[p - I(y \le b)\right](y-b)\right\} \\ &= \sqrt{2p(1-p)}\ \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{\sigma}\left[p - I(y \le \mu + \sigma\alpha s)\right](y-\mu-\sigma\alpha s)\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

Substituting the value of P from equation (A.3) in equation (A.1), canceling terms, writing the *pdf* of S and letting $\kappa = 2p(1-p)/\sigma$, the *pdf* of Y is,

$$\begin{aligned} f(y|\theta) &= \kappa \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{\sigma}\left[p - I(y \le \mu + \sigma\alpha s)\right](y-\mu-\sigma\alpha s)\right\} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\ \exp\left\{-\frac{s^2}{2}\right\} ds \\ &= \kappa \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2\left(\frac{y-\mu}{\sigma} - \alpha s\right)\left[p - I\left(\frac{y-\mu}{\sigma} \le \alpha s\right)\right]\right]\right\} ds \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

Evaluation of the *pdf* $f(y|\theta)$ given by equation (A.4) leads to 4 cases depending on the sign of α and $y^* = (y-\mu)/\sigma$ and we integrate them one at a time. We also employ the earlier introduced notation $p_{\alpha_-} = p - I(\alpha < 0)$ and $p_{\alpha_+} = p - I(\alpha > 0)$ in each cases.

Case (i): When $(\alpha > 0, y^* \le 0)$, then $I(y^* \le \alpha s) = 1$. The corresponding *pdf* is,

$$\begin{aligned} f(y|\theta) &= \kappa \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2\left(\frac{y-\mu}{\sigma} - \alpha s\right)(p-1)\right]\right\} ds \\ &= \kappa \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2\left(y^* - \alpha s\right)p_{\alpha_+}\right]\right\} ds \\ &= \kappa \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(s - \alpha p_{\alpha_+}\right)^2\right\} ds \\ &= \kappa \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \Phi\left(s - \alpha p_{\alpha_+}\right)\Big|_0^\infty \\ &= \kappa\, \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}\right) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

Case (ii): For $(\alpha > 0, y^* > 0)$ we have two cases. Case (a): $y^* > \alpha s$ implies $I(y^* \le \alpha s) = 0$ and this occurs for all $s \in [0, y^*/\alpha)$. Case(b): $y^* \le \alpha s$ implies $I(y^* \le \alpha s) = 1$ and this occurs for all $s \in [y^*/\alpha, \infty)$. Hence the *pdf* is,

$$f(y|\theta) = \kappa \int_0^{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2\left(y^* - \alpha s\right)p\right]\right\} ds +$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\kappa \int_{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2\left(y^* - \alpha s\right)(p-1)\right]\right\} ds \\
&= \kappa \exp\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-}\} \int_0^{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(s^2 - 2\alpha p_{\alpha_-} s\right)\right\} ds + \\
&\quad \kappa \exp\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+}\} \int_{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(s^2 - 2\alpha p_{\alpha_+} s\right)\right\} ds \\
&= \kappa \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \int_0^{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(s - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right)^2\right\} ds + \\
&\quad \kappa \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \int_{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(s^2 - \alpha p_{\alpha_+}\right)^2\right\} ds \\
&= \kappa \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \Phi\left(s - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) \Big|_0^{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}} + \\
&\quad \kappa \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \Phi\left(s - \alpha p_{\alpha_+}\right) \Big|_{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}}^{\infty} \\
&= \kappa \left[\Phi\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) - \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\right] \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} + \\
&\quad \kappa \left[\Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha}\right)\right] \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}. \qquad \text{(A.6)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Case (iii): When $(\alpha < 0, y^* > 0)$, then $I(y^* \leq \alpha s) = 0$ since $\alpha < 0$. Hence we have,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(y|\theta) &= \kappa \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2(y^* - \alpha s) p_{\alpha_+}\right]\right\} ds \\
&= \kappa \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(s - \alpha p_{\alpha_+}\right)^2\right\} ds \\
&= \kappa\, \Phi(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}. \qquad \text{(A.7)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Case (iv): For $(\alpha < 0, y^* \leq 0)$ we have two cases. Case (a): $y^* \leq \alpha s$ implies $I(y^* \leq \alpha s) = 1$ and this occurs for all $s \in [0, y^*/\alpha]$. Case(b): $y^* > \alpha s$ implies $I(y^* \leq \alpha s) = 0$ and this occurs for all $s \in (y^*/\alpha, \infty)$. So we have,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(y|\theta) &= \kappa \int_0^{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2(y^* - \alpha s)(p-1)\right]\right\} ds + \\
&\quad \kappa \int_{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2(y^* - \alpha s) p\right]\right\} ds \\
&= \kappa \int_0^{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2(y^* - \alpha s) p_{\alpha_-}\right]\right\} ds + \\
&\quad \kappa \int_{\frac{y^*}{\alpha}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[s^2 + 2(y^* - \alpha s) p_{\alpha_+}\right]\right\} ds
\end{aligned}
$$

$$= \kappa \left[\Phi\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) - \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\right] \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} +$$
$$\kappa \left[\Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha}\right)\right] \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}, \tag{A.8}$$

where the integration details are similar to Case (ii) and have been suppressed to avoid monotonicity and save space.

Combining all the four cases, i.e. equations (A.5) to (A.8), we have the *pdf* of the GAL distribution given by equation (2). ■

Appendix A.2. Cumulative Distribution Function

Theorem 2: Suppose $Y \sim GAL(\mu, \sigma, p, \alpha)$ and let $y^* = (y-\mu)/\sigma$, then the *cdf* F is,

$$F(y|\theta) = \left(1 - 2\Phi\left(-\frac{y^*}{|\alpha|}\right) - \frac{2p(1-p)}{p_{\alpha_-}} \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \left[\Phi\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. - \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\right]\right) I\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} > 0\right) + I(\alpha < 0) - \frac{2p(1-p)}{p_{\alpha_+}} \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \tag{A.9}$$
$$\times \Phi\left[\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha} I\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} > 0\right)\right].$$

Proof: We note that for any *cdf* $F(y|\theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{y} f(v|\theta)dv = 1 - \int_{y}^{\infty} f(v|\theta)dv$. This property is used in deriving the *cdf* when $y > \mu$ to avoid breaking the region of integration as $(-\infty, \mu) \bigcup (\mu, y)$. We let $v^* = (v-\mu)/\sigma$, combine cases and derive as follows.

Case (i): When $(\alpha > 0, y \leq \mu)$ or $(\alpha < 0, y > \mu)$, the *cdf* is,

$$F(y|\theta) = \begin{cases} \int_{-\infty}^{y} \kappa\Phi(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}) \exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} dv, & \text{if } \alpha > 0, y \leq \mu \\ 1 - \int_{y}^{\infty} \kappa\Phi(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}) \exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} dv, & \text{if } \alpha < 0, y > \mu \end{cases}$$
$$= \begin{cases} \kappa\Phi(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}) \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \left[\frac{\exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_+}\right\}}{-p_{\alpha_+}/\sigma}\right]_{-\infty}^{y}, & \text{if } \alpha > 0, y \leq \mu \\ 1 - \kappa\Phi(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}) \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \left[\frac{\exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_+}\right\}}{-p_{\alpha_+}/\sigma}\right]_{y}^{\infty}, & \text{if } \alpha < 0, y > \mu \end{cases}$$
$$= \begin{cases} \frac{2p(1-p)}{-p_{\alpha_+}} \Phi(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}, & \text{if } \alpha > 0, y \leq \mu \\ 1 - \frac{2p(1-p)}{p_{\alpha_+}} \Phi(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}, & \text{if } \alpha < 0, y > \mu \end{cases} \tag{A.10}$$

where the third step substitutes the value of κ, $p_{\alpha_+} = p - 1$ for $\alpha > 0$ and $p_{\alpha_+} = p$ for $\alpha < 0$.

Case (ii): When $(\alpha < 0, y \leq \mu)$ or $(\alpha > 0, y > \mu)$, the *cdf* is,

$$F(y|\theta) = \begin{cases} \int\limits_{-\infty}^{y} \kappa \Bigg(\left[\Phi\left(\frac{v^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) - \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\right] \exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \\ + \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{v^*}{\alpha}\right) \exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \Bigg) dv, & \text{if } \alpha < 0, y \leq \mu \\ 1 - \int\limits_{y}^{\infty} \kappa \Bigg(\left[\Phi\left(\frac{v^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) - \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\right] \exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \\ + \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{v^*}{\alpha}\right) \exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \Bigg) dv, & \text{if } \alpha > 0, y > \mu. \end{cases} \tag{A.11}$$

Note that in both the subcases of equation (A.11), the integral remains the same and only the limits of integration changes. Hence, we evaluate each terms individually over the limits (a, b) and will substitute values of (a, b) as per our requirement.

To evaluate the first integral component of equation (A.11) denoted C_1, we substitute $z = v^*/\alpha - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}$ and perform integration-by-parts as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \kappa \int_a^b \Phi\left(\frac{v^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) \exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} dv \\ &= \kappa \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \int_{\frac{a^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\frac{b^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}} \left[\alpha\sigma\Phi(z) \exp\{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-} z\}\right] dz \\ &= \kappa\sigma \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \Bigg(\left[\frac{\alpha\Phi(z) \exp\left\{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-} z\right\}}{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}}\right]_{\frac{a^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\frac{b^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}} \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha}{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}} \int_{\frac{a^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\frac{b^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}(z^2 + 2\alpha p_{\alpha_-} z + \alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2 - \alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2)\right\} dz \Bigg) \\ &= \kappa\sigma \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \Bigg(\frac{\exp\left\{\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}}{-p_{\alpha_-}} \Bigg[\Phi\left(\frac{b^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) \exp\left\{-b^* p_{\alpha_-}\right\} \\ &\quad - \Phi\left(\frac{a^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) \exp\left\{-a^* p_{\alpha_-}\right\} \Bigg] + \frac{1}{p_{\alpha_-}} \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \Phi\left(z + \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right)_{\frac{a^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\frac{b^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}} \Bigg) \\ &= -\frac{\kappa\sigma}{p_{\alpha_-}} \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \Bigg[\Phi\left(\frac{b^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) \exp\left\{-b^* p_{\alpha_-}\right\} \\ &\quad - \Phi\left(\frac{a^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) \exp\left\{-a^* p_{\alpha_-}\right\} \Bigg] + \frac{\kappa\sigma}{p_{\alpha_-}} \left[\Phi\left(\frac{b^*}{\alpha}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{a^*}{\alpha}\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

We next evaluate the second component denoted C_2 directly as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_2 &= -\kappa\Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}) \int_a^b \exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} dv \\
&= -\kappa\Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}) \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \left[\frac{\exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_-}\right\}}{-p_{\alpha_-}/\sigma}\right]_a^b \\
&= \frac{\kappa\sigma}{p_{\alpha_-}} \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}) \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \left[\exp\left\{-b^* p_{\alpha_-}\right\} - \exp\left\{-a^* p_{\alpha_-}\right\}\right]. \qquad \text{(A.13)}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, to evaluate the third component denoted C_3 we use the substitution $z = \alpha p_{\alpha_+} - v^*/\alpha$ and integrate-by-parts as done in C_1. We suppress the details for brevity and present the final expression.

$$\begin{aligned}
C_3 &= \kappa \int_a^b \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{v^*}{\alpha} \exp\left\{-v^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}\right) dv \\
&= -\frac{\kappa\sigma}{p_{\alpha_+}} \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \left[\Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{b^*}{\alpha}\right) \exp\{-b^* p_{\alpha_+}\} - \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{a^*}{\alpha}\right) \exp\{-a^* p_{\alpha_+}\}\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{\kappa\sigma}{p_{\alpha_+}} \left[\Phi\left(-\frac{b^*}{\alpha}\right) - \Phi\left(-\frac{a^*}{\alpha}\right)\right]. \qquad \text{(A.14)}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Phi\left(\frac{b^*}{\alpha}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{a^*}{\alpha}\right) = -\Phi\left(-\frac{b^*}{\alpha}\right) + \Phi\left(-\frac{a^*}{\alpha}\right)$ and hence the relevant term from equation (A.12) and equation (A.14) can be collected together when adding the expressions.

When $\alpha < 0$ and $y \leq \mu$, the limits of integration $a = -\infty$ and $b = y$ implies $a^* = -\infty$ and $b^* = y^*$, respectively. Substituting the values of a^*, b^* and κ in C_1, C_2 and C_3 and summing the expression yields,

$$\begin{aligned}
F(y|\theta) &= 2\Phi\left(-\frac{y^*}{\alpha}\right) - \frac{2p(1-p)}{p_{\alpha_-}} \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \left[\Phi\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right) - \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\right] \\
&\quad - \frac{2p(1-p)}{p_{\alpha_+}} \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha}\right). \qquad \text{(A.15)}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, when $\alpha > 0$ and $y > \mu$, the limits of integration $a = y$ and $b = \infty$ implies $a^* = y^*$ and $b^* = \infty$, respectively. Substituting the values of a^*, b^* and κ in C_1, C_2 and C_3 and evaluating the expression $1 - C_1 - C_2 - C_3$, yields

$$F(y|\theta) = 1 - 2\Phi\left(-\frac{y^*}{\alpha}\right) - \frac{2p(1-p)}{p_{\alpha_-}} \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \left[\Phi\left(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\right)\right.$$

$$- \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\Big] - \frac{2p(1-p)}{p_{\alpha_+}} \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\} \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha}\right). \quad \text{(A.16)}$$

Combining the equations (A.10), (A.15) and (A.16), we have the *cdf* of the GAL distribution given by equation (3). ■

Appendix A.3. Moment Generating Function

Thoerem 3: Suppose $Y \sim GAL(\mu, \sigma, p, \alpha)$, then the *mgf* denoted $M_Y(t)$ is as follows,

$$M_Y(t) = 2p(1-p)\left[\frac{(p_{\alpha_+} - p_{\alpha_-})}{(p_{\alpha_-} - \sigma t)(p_{\alpha_+} - \sigma t)}\right] \exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2 t^2\right\} \Phi\Big(|\alpha|\sigma t\Big). \quad \text{(A.17)}$$

Proof: Using the definition of the *mgf* we have,

$$M_Y(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(ty) f(y|\mu, \sigma, p, \alpha)\, dy. \quad \text{(A.18)}$$

Substituting the GAL *pdf* (2) into equation (A.18), leads to two cases depending on $\alpha > 0$ or $\alpha < 0$. We again use the notation $\kappa = 2p(1-p)/\sigma$ and break the region of integration depending on $y^* > 0$ (i.e., $y > \mu$) or $y^* \leq 0$ (i.e., $y \leq \mu$).

Case (i): When $\alpha > 0$ and $y^* > 0$ (i.e., $y > \mu$), we have the following three components,

$$\begin{aligned}
M_1 &= \kappa \int_{\mu}^{\infty} \exp\{ty\}\, \Phi\Big(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\Big) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha p_{\alpha_-})^2\right\} dy, \\
M_2 &= -\kappa \int_{\mu}^{\infty} \exp\{ty\}\, \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha p_{\alpha_-})^2\right\} dy, \\
M_3 &= \kappa \int_{\mu}^{\infty} \exp\{ty\}\, \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha}\right) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha p_{\alpha_+})^2\right\} dy,
\end{aligned} \quad \text{(A.19)}$$

and when $\alpha > 0$ and $y^* \leq 0$ (i.e., $y \leq \mu$) we have,

$$M_4 = \kappa \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} \exp\{ty\}\, \Phi\Big(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}\Big) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha p_{\alpha_+})^2\right\} dy. \quad \text{(A.20)}$$

We first consider M_1, substitute $z = \frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}$, change the limits of integration and integrate-by-parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_1 &= \int_{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\infty} \kappa\alpha\sigma\, \exp\Big\{\mu t + \alpha\sigma(z + \alpha p_{\alpha_-})t\Big\} \Phi(z) \exp\left\{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}(z + \alpha p_{\alpha_-}) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} dz \\
&= \kappa\alpha\sigma \exp\left\{\mu t + \alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}\sigma t - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\} \int_{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\infty} \Phi(z) \exp\Big\{-\alpha(p_{\alpha_-} - \sigma t)z\Big\} dz
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \kappa\alpha\sigma \exp\left\{\mu t + \alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}\sigma t - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}\left[\Phi(z)\,\frac{\exp\{-\alpha(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)z\}}{-\alpha(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}\Big|_{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\infty}\right.\\
&\quad \left. - \int_{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\infty} \phi(z)\,\frac{\exp\{-\alpha(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)z\}}{-\alpha(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}\,dz\right] \qquad \text{(limit exists only if } t < p/\sigma)\\
&= \kappa\sigma \frac{\exp\left\{\mu t + \alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}\sigma t - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}}{(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}\left[\exp\{\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)\}\Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}) + \right.\\
&\quad \left. \exp\left\{\frac{\alpha^2}{2}(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)^2\right\}\int_{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\Big(z+\alpha(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)^2\Big)\right\}dz\right]\\
&= \kappa\sigma \frac{\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}}{(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}\Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}) + \kappa\sigma \frac{\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2 t^2\right\}}{(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}\,\Phi\Big(z+\alpha(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)\Big)\Big|_{-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}}^{\infty}\\
&= \kappa\sigma \frac{\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}}{(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}\,\Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}) + \kappa\sigma \frac{\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2 t^2\right\}}{(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}\,\Phi(\alpha\sigma t). \qquad \text{(A.21)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Secondly, we integrate the expression for M_2 as follows,

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_2 &= -\kappa\int_{\mu}^{\infty}\exp\{ty\}\,\Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}dy\\
&= -\kappa\,\Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\exp\left\{\frac{p_{\alpha_-}\mu}{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}\int_{\mu}^{\infty}\exp\left\{-\frac{(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}{\sigma}\,y\right\}dy\\
&= -\kappa\,\Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-})\exp\left\{\frac{p_{\alpha_-}\mu}{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}\times\frac{(-1)(-\sigma)}{(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}\exp\left\{\frac{-(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}{\sigma}\mu\right\}\\
&= -\kappa\sigma\frac{\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_-}^2\right\}}{(p_{\alpha_-}-\sigma t)}\,\Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}) \qquad \text{(limit exists only if } t < p/\sigma). \qquad \text{(A.22)}
\end{aligned}
$$

The integral M_3 is evaluated by substituting $z = \alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha}$. Thereafter the integration is analogous to M_1 with the existence condition $t > (p-1)/\alpha$ and yields,

$$
M_3 = \kappa\sigma\frac{\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}}{(p_{\alpha_+}-\sigma t)}\,\Phi(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}) - \kappa\sigma\frac{\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2 t^2\right\}}{(p_{\alpha_+}-\sigma t)}\,\Phi(\alpha\sigma t). \qquad \text{(A.23)}
$$

The integral M_4 can be directly evaluated and closely follows the steps in the integration of M_2 with the resulting expression,

$$
M_4 = -\kappa\sigma\frac{\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 p_{\alpha_+}^2\right\}}{(p_{\alpha_+}-\sigma t)}\,\Phi(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}). \qquad \text{(A.24)}
$$

where the limits of integration exists only for $t > (p-1)/\sigma$.

To obtain the *mgf* of the GAL distribution, we substitute the values of κ and sum the four equations (A.21), (A.22), (A.23) and (A.24). This yields,

$$M_Y(t) = 2p(1-p)\left[\frac{(p_{\alpha_+} - p_{\alpha_-})}{(p_{\alpha_-} - \sigma t)(p_{\alpha_+} - \sigma t)}\right] \exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2 t^2\right\} \Phi(\alpha\sigma t). \tag{A.25}$$

Case (ii): When $\alpha < 0$ and $y^* \leq 0$ (i.e., $y \leq \mu$), we have the following three components of the *mgf*,

$$\begin{aligned}
M_5 &= \kappa \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} \exp\{ty\}\, \Phi\Big(\frac{y^*}{\alpha} - \alpha p_{\alpha_-}\Big) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha p_{\alpha_-})^2\right\} dy, \\
M_6 &= -\kappa \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} \exp\{ty\}\, \Phi(-\alpha p_{\alpha_-}) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_-} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha p_{\alpha_-})^2\right\} dy, \\
M_7 &= \kappa \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} \exp\{ty\}\, \Phi\left(\alpha p_{\alpha_+} - \frac{y^*}{\alpha}\right) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha p_{\alpha_+})^2\right\} dy,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.26}$$

and when $\alpha < 0$ and $y^* > 0$ (i.e., $y > \mu$) we have,

$$M_8 = \kappa \int_{\mu}^{\infty} \exp\{ty\}\, \Phi\Big(\alpha p_{\alpha_+}\Big) \exp\left\{-y^* p_{\alpha_+} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha p_{\alpha_+})^2\right\} dy. \tag{A.27}$$

The integration of the terms M_5 to M_8 are similar to the case when $\alpha > 0$ and results in the following *mgf*,

$$M_Y(t) = 2p(1-p)\left[\frac{(p_{\alpha_+} - p_{\alpha_-})}{(p_{\alpha_-} - \sigma t)(p_{\alpha_+} - \sigma t)}\right] \exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2 t^2\right\} \Phi(-\alpha\sigma t). \tag{A.28}$$

Combining the *mgf* for the two cases, i.e. equations (A.25) and (A.28), we have the *mgf* of the GAL distribution. ■

The mean, variance and skewness of the GAL distribution can be obtained from the GAL *mgf* (A.17). We state this in terms of a theorem below.

Thoerem 4: Suppose $Y \sim GAL(\mu, \sigma, p, \alpha)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y) &= \mu + \frac{2|\alpha|\sigma}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + \sigma\frac{(1-2p)}{p(1-p)} \\ V(Y) &= \alpha^2\sigma^2\left(1-\frac{2}{\pi}\right) + \sigma^2\left[\frac{1-2p+2p^2}{p^2(1-p)^2}\right] \\ S(Y) &= \frac{\alpha^3\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\left(\frac{4}{\pi}-1\right) + 2\left[\frac{(1-p)^3-p^3}{p^3(1-p)^3}\right]}{\left\{\alpha^2\left(1-\frac{2}{\pi}\right) + \left[\frac{1-2p+2p^2}{p^2(1-p)^2}\right]\right\}^{3/2}} \end{aligned} \tag{A.29}$$

where $E(Y)$, $V(Y)$ and $S(Y)$ denote the mean, variance and skewness, respectively.

Proof: Taking logarithm of the *mgf* and keeping terms involving t we have,

$$\ln M_Y(t) \propto -\ln(p_{\alpha_-} - \sigma t) - \ln(p_{\alpha_+} - \sigma t) + \mu t + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2 t^2 + \ln\Phi(|\alpha|\sigma t). \tag{A.30}$$

Taking the first, second and third derivative of equation (A.30) and evaluating at $t = 0$ we get,

$$\begin{aligned} m_1(Y) = E(Y) &= \frac{\partial \ln M_Y(t)}{\partial t}\Big|_{t=0} = \mu + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\,\alpha\sigma + \sigma\frac{(1-2p)}{p(1-p)} \\ m_2(Y) = V(Y) &= \frac{\partial^2 \ln M_Y(t)}{\partial t^2}\Big|_{t=0} = \alpha^2\sigma^2\left(1-\frac{2}{\pi}\right) + \sigma^2\left[\frac{1-2p+2p^2}{p^2(1-p)^2}\right] \\ m_3(Y) &= \frac{\partial^3 \ln M_Y(t)}{\partial t^3}\Big|_{t=0} = \alpha^3\sigma^3\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\left(\frac{4}{\pi}-1\right) + 2\sigma^3\left[\frac{(1-p)^3-p^3}{p^3(1-p)^3}\right] \end{aligned}$$

where $m_1(Y), m_2(Y)$ and $m_3(Y)$ are the first, second and third order central moments, respectively. Hence, skewness can be obtained as $\frac{m_3}{(m_2^{3/2})}$. ■

Appendix B. Conditional Densities in FBQROR model

In this appendix, we derive the conditional posteriors of the FBQROR model parameters. Specifically, the conditional posteriors of β, ν, h, σ, and z are tractable and follow standard distributions. However, the parameter γ and the transformed cut-point vector δ does not have a tractable conditional distribution and is sampled using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. The derivations below follow the ordering as presented in Algorithm 1.

(1) Starting with β, the conditional posterior $\pi(\beta|z, \nu, h, \sigma, \gamma)$ is proportional to $\pi(\beta) \times$

$f(z|\beta,\nu,h,\sigma,\gamma)$ and its kernel can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\beta|z,\nu,h,\sigma,\gamma) &\propto \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{(z_i - x_i'\beta - A\nu_i - C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{\sigma B\nu_i} + (\beta-\beta_0)'B_0^{-1}(\beta-\beta_0)\right]\right\} \\
&\propto \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\left[\beta'\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{x_i x_i'}{\sigma B\nu_i} + B_0^{-1}\right)\beta - \beta'\left(\frac{x_i(z_i - A\nu_i - C|\gamma|h_i)}{\sigma B\nu_i} + B_0^{-1}\beta_0\right)\right.\right. \\
&\qquad \left.\left. - \left(\frac{x_i'(z_i - A\nu_i - C|\gamma|h_i)}{\sigma B\nu_i} + \beta_0' B_0^{-1}\right)\right]\right\} \\
&\propto \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\left[\beta'\tilde{B}^{-1}\beta - \beta'\tilde{B}^{-1}\tilde{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}'\tilde{B}^{-1}\beta + \tilde{\beta}'\tilde{B}^{-1}\tilde{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}'\tilde{B}^{-1}\tilde{\beta}\right]\right\} \\
&\propto \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}(\beta-\tilde{\beta})'\tilde{B}^{-1}(\beta-\tilde{\beta})\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the posterior variance $\tilde{B}$ and the posterior mean $\tilde{\beta}$ are defined as follows:

$$\tilde{B}^{-1} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{x_i x_i'}{\sigma B\nu_i} + B_0^{-1}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta} = \tilde{B}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{x_i(z_i - A\nu_i - C|\gamma|h_i)}{\sigma B\nu_i} + B_0^{-1}\beta_0\right).$$

Hence, the conditional posterior is a normal distribution and $\beta|z,\nu,h,\sigma,\gamma \sim N(\tilde{\beta},\tilde{B})$.

(2) The conditional posterior of ν is obtained from the joint posterior density by collecting terms involving ν. This is done element-wise as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\nu_i|z,\beta,h,\sigma,\gamma) &\propto \nu_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{(z_i - x_i'\beta - A\nu_i - C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{\sigma B\nu_i}\right] - \frac{\nu_i}{\sigma}\right\} \\
&\propto \nu_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{(z_i - x_i'\beta - C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{\sigma B}\nu_i^{-1} + \left(\frac{A^2}{\sigma B} + \frac{2}{\sigma}\right)\nu_i\right]\right\} \\
&\propto \nu_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\left[a_i\nu_i^{-1} + b\nu_i\right]\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which is recognized as the kernel of a generalized inverse-Gaussian (GIG) distribution where,

$$a_i = \frac{(z_i - x_i'\beta - C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{\sigma B} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \left(\frac{A^2}{\sigma B} + \frac{2}{\sigma}\right).$$

Hence, $\nu_i|z,\beta,h,\sigma,\gamma \sim GIG(0.5,a_i,b)$ for $i = 1,2,\ldots,n$.

(3) The conditional posterior of the scale parameter σ, represented by $\pi(\sigma|z,\beta,\nu,h,\gamma)$

is proportional to $f(z|\beta,\nu,h,\sigma,\gamma)\pi(\nu|\sigma)\pi(\sigma)$, and can be derived as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\sigma|z,\beta,\nu,h,\gamma) &\propto (\sigma)^{-\frac{3n+n_0}{2}-1}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{(z_i-x_i'\beta-A\nu_i-C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{\sigma B\nu_i}\right]-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\nu_i}{\sigma}-\frac{d_0}{2\sigma}\right\}\\ &\propto (\sigma)^{-\frac{3n+n_0}{2}-1}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{(z_i-x_i'\beta-A\nu_i-C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{B\nu_i}+2\sum_{i=1}^{n}\nu_i+d_0\right]\right\}\\ &\propto (\sigma)^{-\frac{\tilde{n}}{2}-1}\exp\left\{-\frac{\tilde{d}}{2\sigma}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

which is recognized as the kernel of an IG distribution where we have utilized the notations:

$$\tilde{n}=3n+n_0,\qquad \text{and}\qquad \tilde{d}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{(z_i-x_i'\beta-A\nu_i-C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{B\nu_i}+2\sum_{i=1}^{n}\nu_i+d_0$$

Hence, we have $\sigma|z,\beta,\nu,h,\gamma\sim IG(\tilde{n}/2,\tilde{d}/2)$.

(4) The shape parameter γ and mixture variable h are sampled in a block, since sampling conditional on each other leads to high autocorrelation in MCMC draws.

(a) The shape parameter γ is sampled marginally of (z,ν,h) from the full joint posterior which is proportional to the full likelihood (9) times the priors (13). Collecting terms involving γ does not yield a tractable distribution, so γ is sampled using an MH step. The proposed draw γ' is generated from a scaled-Beta distribution denoted $\pi_{SB}(\gamma|a,b,L,U)$ and accepted with MH probability as,

$$\alpha_{MH}(\gamma_c,\gamma')=\min\left\{0,\ln\left[\frac{f(y|\beta,\sigma,\delta,\gamma')\,\pi(\beta,\sigma,\delta,\gamma')}{f(y|\beta,\sigma,\delta,\gamma_c)\,\pi(\beta,\sigma,\delta,\gamma_c)}\,\frac{\pi_{SB}(\gamma_c|a,b,L,U)}{\pi_{SB}(\gamma'|a,b,L,U)}\right]\right\},$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is the full likelihood (9) and $\pi(\beta,\sigma,\delta,\gamma)$ are the priors (13); otherwise, the current value γ_c is repeated in the next MCMC iteration. Note that the parameters (A,B,C) depend on p which is turn is a function of p_0 and γ.

(b) The conditional posterior of h is obtained element-wise from the complete posterior density (15) conditional on γ and remaining parameters as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(h_i|z,\beta,\nu,\sigma,\gamma) &\propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{(z_i-x_i'\beta-A\nu_i-C|\gamma|h_i)^2}{\sigma B\nu_i}+\frac{h_i^2}{\sigma^2}\right]\right\}\\ &\propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2}+\frac{C^2\gamma^2}{\sigma B\nu_i}\right)h_i^2-\frac{2C|\gamma|(z_i-x_i'\beta-A\nu_i)}{\sigma B\nu_i}h_i\right]\right\}\\ &\propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[(\sigma_{h_i}^2)^{-1}h_i^2-2(\sigma_{h_i}^2)^{-1}\mu_{h_i}h_i\right]\right\}\end{aligned}$$

$$\propto \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}(\sigma^2_{h_i})^{-1}(h_i - \mu_{h_i})^2 \right\},$$

where the third line introduces the following notations:

$$(\sigma^2_{h_i})^{-1} = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} + \frac{C^2\gamma^2}{\sigma B \nu_i}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{h_i} = \sigma^2_{h_i}\left(\frac{C|\gamma|(z_i - x_i'\beta - A\nu_i)}{\sigma B \nu_i}\right),$$

and the fourth line adds and subtracts $(\sigma^2_{h_i})^{-1}\mu^2_{h_i}$ to complete the square. The last expression is recognized as the kernel of a half-normal distribution and hence, $h_i|z, \beta, \nu, \sigma, \gamma \sim N^+(\mu_{h_i}, \sigma^2_{h_i})$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

(5) Similar to Jeliazkov et al. (2008) and Rahman (2016), the transformed cut-point δ is sampled from the full likelihood (9), marginally of (z, ν, h). The proposed values are generated from a random-walk chain, $\delta' = \delta_c + u$, where $u \sim N(0_{J-3}, \iota^2\hat{D})$, ι is a tuning parameter and $\hat{D}$ denotes negative inverse Hessian, obtained by maximizing the log-likelihood with respect to δ. Given the current value δ_c and δ', the proposed value δ' is accepted with MH probability,

$$\alpha_{MH}(\delta_c, \delta') = \min\left\{0, \ln\left[\frac{f(y|\beta, \sigma, \gamma, \delta')\,\pi(\beta, \sigma, \gamma, \delta')}{f(y|\beta, \sigma, \gamma, \delta_c)\,\pi(\beta, \sigma, \gamma, \delta_c)}\right]\right\},$$

otherwise, the current value δ_c is repeated. The variance of u may be tuned as required for an appropriate step-size and acceptance rate.

(6) The full conditional density of the latent variable z is a truncated normal distribution where the cut-point vector ξ is obtained based on one-to-one mapping with δ. Hence, z is sampled as $z_i|\beta, \nu, h, \sigma, \gamma, \delta, y \sim TN_{(\xi_{j-1}, \xi_j)}(x_i'\beta + A\nu_i + C|\gamma|h_i, \sigma B\nu_i)$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $j = 1, \cdots, J$.

References

Alhamzawi, R. (2012), "Variable Selection in Quantile Regression via Gibbs Sampling," *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 39, 799–813.

Alhamzawi, R. (2016), "Bayesian Model Selection in Ordinal Quantile Regression," *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 103, 68–78.

Benoit, D. F. and Poel, D. V. D. (2010), "Binary Quantile Regression: A Bayesian Approach based on the Asymmetric Laplace Distribution," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 27, 1174–1188.

Botev, Z. (2016), "The Normal Law Under Linear Restrictions: Simulation and Estimation via Minimax Tilting," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society – Series B*, TBA, (forthcoming).

Dagpunar, J. (1988), *Principles of Random Variate Generation*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Dagpunar, J. (1989), "An Easily Implemented Generalized Inverse Gaussian Generator," *Communications in Statistics – Simulation and Computation*, 18, 703–710.

Dagpunar, J. (2007), *Simulations and Monte Carlo: With Applications in Finance and MCMC*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., UK.

Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., Stern, H. S., Dunson, D. B., Vehtari, A., and Rubin, D. B. (2013), *Bayesian Data Analysis*, Chapman & Hall, New York.

Geraci, M. and Bottai, M. (2007), "Quantile Regression for Longitudinal Data Using the Asymmetric Laplace Distribution," *Biostatistics*, 8, 140–154.

Greenberg, E. (2012), *Introduction to Bayesian Econometrics*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Jeliazkov, I. and Rahman, M. A. (2012), "Binary and Ordinal Data Analysis in Economics: Modeling and Estimation," in *Mathematical Modeling with Multidisciplinary Applications*, ed. X. S. Yang, pp. 123–150, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New Jersey.

Jeliazkov, I., Graves, J., and Kutzbach, M. (2008), "Fitting and Comparison of Models for Multivariate Ordinal Outcomes," *Advances in Econometrics: Bayesian Econometrics*, 23, 115–156.

Johnson, V. E. and Albert, J. H. (2000), *Ordinal Data Modeling*, Springer, New York.

Kobayashi, G. (2016), "Bayesian Endogenous Tobit Quantile Regression," *Bayesian Analysis*, TBA, (forthcoming).

Koenker, R. (2005), *Quantile Regression*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Koenker, R. and Bassett, G. (1978), "Regression Quantiles," *Econometrica*, 46, 33–50.

Koenker, R. and Machado, J. A. F. (1999), "Goodness of Fit and Related Inference Processes for Quantile Regression," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94, 1296–1310.

Kotz, S., Kozubowski, T. J., and Podgorski, K. (2001), *The Laplace Distribution and Generalizations: A Revisit with Applications to Communications, Economics, Engineering and Finance*, Birkhäuser, Boston.

Kozumi, H. and Kobayashi, G. (2011), "Gibbs Sampling Methods for Bayesian Quantile Regression," *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 81, 1565–1578.

Kozumi, H. and Kobayashi, G. (2012), "Bayesian Analysis of Quantile Regression for Censored Dynamic Panel Data Model," *Computational Statistics*, 27, 359–380.

Lee, D. and Neocleous, T. (2010), "Bayesian Quantile Regression for Count Data with Application to Environmental Epidemiology," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society – Series C*, 59, 905–920.

Luo, Y., Lian, H., and Tian, M. (2012), "Bayesian Quantile Regression for Longitudinal Data Models," *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 82, 1635–1649.

Mukherjee, D. and Rahman, M. A. (2016), "To Drill or Not to Drill? An Econometric Analysis of US Public Opinion," *Energy Policy*, 91, 341–351.

Rahman, M. A. (2016), "Bayesian Quantile Regression for Ordinal Models," *Bayesian Analysis*, 11, 1–24.

Reed, C. and Yu, K. (2009), "A Partially Collapsed Gibbs Sampler for Bayesian Quantile Regression," Technical Report, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Brunel University.

Reich, B. J. and Smith, L. B. (2013), "Bayesian Quantile Regression for Censored Data," *Biometrics*, 69, 651–660.

Spiegelhalter, D. J., Best, N. G., Carlin, B. P., and van der linde, A. (2002), "Bayesian Measures of Model Complexity and Fit," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society – Series B*, 64, 583–639.

Tsionas, E. (2003), "Bayesian Quantile Inference," *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 73, 659–674.

Yan, Y. and Kottas, A. (2016), "A New Family of Error Distributions for Bayesian Quantile Regression," *Working Paper*.

Yu, K. and Moyeed, R. A. (2001), "Bayesian Quantile Regression," *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 54, 437–447.

Yu, K. and Stander, J. (2007), "Bayesian Analysis of a Tobit Quantile Regression Model," *Journal of Econometrics*, 137, 260–276.

Yu, K. and Zhang, J. (2005), "A Three Paramter Asymmetric Laplace Distribution and its Extensions," *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 34, 1867–1879.

Yu, K., Chen, C. W. S., Reed, C., and Dunson, D. B. (2013), "Bayesian Variable Selection in Quantile Regression," *Statistics and its Interface*, 6, 261–274.